	GB29FLO1 Trial	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
3		
4	v. 15 Cr. 765 (PAC)	
5	EFRAIN ANTONIO CAMPO FLORES and FRANQUI FRANCISCO FLORES DE FREITAS,	
6	Defendants.	
7	x	
8	New York, N.Y. November 2, 2016 10:10 a.m.	
9	Before:	
10	HON. PAUL A. CROTTY,	
11	District Judge	
12	APPEARANCES	
13	PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the	
14	Southern District of New York EMIL J. BOVE III	
15	BRENDAN F. QUIGLEY Assistant United States Attorneys	
16	BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP	
17	Attorneys for Defendant Campo Flores RANDALL W. JACKSON	
18	JOHN T. ZACH JOANNA CHRISTINE WRIGHT	
19	SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP	
20	Attorneys for Defendant Floresde Freitas DAVID M. RODY	
21	ELIZABETH A. ESPINOSA	
22	MICHAEL D. MANN	
23	ALSO PRESENT:	
24	HUMBERTO GARCIA MERCEDES AVALOS	
25	Spanish Interpreters	

Case 1:15-cr-00765-PAC Document 135 Filed 12/06/16 Page 2 of 16 GB29FL01 Trial (In open court) THE COURT: Good morning. I'm glad we're all together. It took a little bit of extra doing. (Case called) MR. BOVE: Good morning, your Honor. Emil Bove and Brendan Quigley for the government. We have here with us Special Agent Sandalio Gonzalez and Peter Calabrese from my office. MR. JACKSON: Good morning, your Honor. Randall Jackson, John Zach and Joanna Wright for defendant Efrain Campo Flores. MR. RODY: Good morning, your Honor. Dave Rody, Mike Mann, and Elizabeth Espinosa for Mr. Franqui Flores. THE COURT: Has everybody been briefed now on the

timing of the jury selection?

MR. JACKSON: Yes, your Honor.

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Now there's a problem. We have a lot -we're going to have over a hundred potential jurors.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: 94 is the number.

THE COURT: Approximately a hundred. Which we want to have in the courtroom. So this is a public proceeding. public has a right to attend. I don't want to have the public mixed with the jury pool. Anybody have any suggestions?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, it might make sense to ask the press to adopt the last row of the courtroom and any standing room that is after that and then allow the jurors to fill in to the seats that are in front of that.

THE COURT: I'm just looking at the audience,

Mr. Jackson. It's bigger than one row. How about an overflow room?

MR. JACKSON: An overflow room makes a lot of sense to us, your Honor, if it's available to the Court.

THE COURT: Mr. Rody.

MR. RODY: Fine with us, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove?

MR. BOVE: Sounds good, Judge.

THE COURT: Can we get an overflow?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: I'm sure we can. We'll work on it.

THE COURT: Anything anyone wants to bring up this morning? I'm going to go through my in limine rulings.

MR. BOVE: No, your Honor. Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: No, your Honor.

MR. RODY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

I have read the parties' motions in limine and considered all of the arguments they have raised. I'm going to rule now on the in limine motions.

With regard to the defendants' in limine motions,

motions in limine. First of all, I'll deal with the security measures.

Defendants' request with regard to security measures at trial are granted in part and denied in part. I have consulted with the U.S. Marshal. I have concluded that the security screening procedures upon entrance of the building are sufficient to guarantee safety. Accordingly, there will be no metal detectors outside the courtroom. The defendants are in custody. We'll have a full complement of marshals with the defendants so that no additional U.S. marshals will be required. I note that the Supervising Deputy U.S. marshal will be monitoring courtroom security with visits from time to time. I will allow two Court Security Officers to attend the sessions of the court.

The protected witnesses will be allowed to testify using a pseudonym. Defendants' request that no ban be placed on courtroom artists ability to sketch witnesses is denied. I am satisfied that there are serious safety concerns for certain testifying witnesses and believe allowing them to testify using the pseudonyms and without recording is necessary for their protection and the protection of their families.

With regard to in limine motion No. 1 by the defendants. The defendants' request to exclude evidence or argument showing that the defendants have wealth or a lifestyle supported through illegitimate income. That application is

denied. The government has represented that it does not intend to introduce evidence relating to the sources of the defendants' wealth or argue that the defendants supported themselves through illegitimate means because they had a lifestyle beyond their legitimate income. The government will be allowed to attempt to prove that the defendants had access to and the ability to procure private aircraft. That is probative of the defendants' participation in the charged conspiracy and their ability to facilitate the dispatch of cocaine.

With respect to in limine motion No. 2. The defendants' request that CS-1 be precluded from offering testimony regarding the identity of the white powdery substance is denied. CS-1 may properly offer lay witness opinion testimony that the substance was cocaine. The Committee Notes to the 2000 amendment to Rule 701 state that a lay witness may "testify that a substance appeared to be a narcotic, so long as a foundation of familiarity with the substance is established." CS-1 has familiarity with cocaine, and he saw, touched, and smelled the substance. Ingestion is not required for CS-1 to offer his lay opinion.

The request with regard to CS-2 that he be precluded from offering testimony regarding the identity of the white powdery substance is granted. CS-2 does not have the same familiarity with cocaine as CS-1, and he only testified that he

only saw the substance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With regard to in limine motion No. 3. Defendants' request to preclude the government from introducing any references to FARC, or the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia, please excuse my Spanish, in the defendants' postarrest statement, that application is denied. FARC is said to be the source of supply for the cocaine at issue here. Campo so states in his talk with Gonzalez and in his earlier conversation with CS-1. The government will be allowed to refer to FARC as a paramilitary organization operating in Colombia, Venezuela, and Ecuador that is one of the largest producers of cocaine in the world, but the government will not refer to FARC as "designated foreign terrorist organization." The statements allowed are probative of the source of supply and of the defendants' capability to procure cocaine, and such probative value is not substantially outweighed by a risk of unfair prejudice.

Defendants' request to preclude the government from offering statements made by CW-1 is denied. The government may introduce through Special Agent Gonzalez certain limited statements made by CS-1 to provide background and context for the jury. The government may not elicit any statements by CW-1 to Gonzalez which are listed in footnote 12 at page 18 of the government's opposition to the defendants' motions in limine.

Special Agent Gonzalez may testify that CW-1 contacted

Special Agent Gonzalez that he gave instructions to CW-1; that CW-1 provided a picture of the October 2015 meeting in Honduras and that CW-1 said that he did not record the meeting. This testimony my include the following subjects: One, in early October 2015, CS-1 reported to Agent Gonzalez via BBM that CW-1 had been contacted regarding potential cocaine transactions involving Venezuelan nationals; two, on October 3, CW-1 reported to Agent Gonzalez via BBM that one or more Venezuelans were coming to meet him -- meet with him that day near Lago de Yojoa about a drug trafficking venture; and three, CW-1 informed Agent Gonzalez that the Venezuelans with whom he had met had requested that he send representatives to Venezuela.

In limine motion No. 4. Defendants' request to preclude admission of certain statements on the recordings made during the October 23, 2015 meeting in Venezuela is denied. Statements and references to war, jail, and the upcoming political campaign and donations are probative of defendants' motive to engage in conspiracy and their knowledge of the object of the scheme, and they are not unduly prejudicial. If the government seeks to introduce the trial statements beyond those identified by the government, the defendants can object at that time.

Now with regard to the government's motions in limine. In limine No. 1. For the reasons I denied defendants' third motion in limine, I grant the government's request to certain

GB29FL01

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

limited nonhearsay statements of CW-1 to provide background and context for the investigation.

Motion in limine No. 2. As previously indicated on the defendants' second motion in limine, I grant the government's request to allow CS-1 to testify that the white powdery substance he examined at the meeting of October 27, 2015 is cocaine, and I deny the government's request to allow CS-2 to testify as to what the substance was.

In limine No. 3. The government's request to introduce evidence regarding defendants' activities between May and August of 2015 to obtain weapons is granted. direct evidence that is relevant and probative of the charged conspiracy, and it is not unduly prejudicial.

Motion in limine No. 4. The government's request for exclusion of questioning regarding the DOJ's May 12, 2014 policy concerning electronic recording of statements is The defendants may ask about the DEA's agents ability to record the defendants' custodial statements and the reasons for not doing so, but the probative value of asking about the DOJ recording policy is outweighed by the risk of undue delay and the introduction of confusion on a collateral issue.

The government's request that the defendant not be allowed to admit self-serving portions of their prior statements to the extent that they would not be otherwise admissible pursuant to a hearsay exception is denied without

prejudice. The government's blanket request does not identify which statements it seeks to exclude. In these circumstances it is not possible to determine whether those statements should be considered at the same time as any admitted portions of the evidence.

In limine motion No. 6. The appropriate security measures for trial have already been addressed.

No. 7. The government's request that the defendants be precluded from introducing an entrapment defense is denied. The government's request is certainly premature. With regard to <u>Bruton v. United States</u>, the Supreme Court held in <u>Bruton v. United States</u> that the Sixth Amendment's confrontation clause precludes the admission of a nontestifying codefendant's implication of a defendant. The government will redact certain specified material in Mr. Flores de Freitas's confession to address this issue. The Court invites the parties to submit appropriate limiting instructions to the jury.

With regard to sealing of the motion papers, I now turn to the question of sealing portions of the briefing on the government's motions in limine. The parties should file the briefs they submitted for in camera review with the following redactions:

Exhibits B, C and D to the government's motion in limine;

Sensitive information contained in the government's

motion regarding security measures and references to such sensitive information in the defendants' opposition, including pages 38 and 39;

References to Rule 404(b) evidence that the Court has not ruled on, including pages 3, 4, 39 and in footnote 12 of the government's motions, and pages 16 through 23 and 41 of the defendants' opposition.

I note I have received your requests to charge but -I did not receive a verdict form. So if you want to submit a
verdict form we'll consider that as well.

Mr. Ovalles advises me that I did submit a verdict form. I haven't seen it yet. So you've complied with that request.

Marlon, what time do you estimate we'll get together again?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Well we estimate to receive the hardship questionnaires around 11:30 a.m., maybe sometime before then. I expect we should resume or reconvene at around that time.

THE COURT: 11:30.

MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, brief question about the questionnaires.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. JACKSON: Will the Court be delivering the copies of the questionnaires to the parties in advance of us

reconvening or in advance of us -- in advance of the jury pool coming in?

THE COURT: Well, what I normally do is after we've gone through all the questions that you've submitted questions on, I have my own questions, we've blended them together. I ask questions. And then I ask the jurors after we have the twelve, we've gone through them, ask them to review the separate background information. Do you have a copy?

I give each juror the -- what is your name? What is your date of birth? Where were you born?

Is that what you're referring to, Mr. Jackson?

MR. JACKSON: No, your Honor. I just know that they're receiving the questionnaires.

THE COURT: The hardship questionnaires?

MR. JACKSON: The hardship questionnaires, your Honor. So I just was curious procedurally is the Court going to -- are we going to come in and get a chance to look at the written questionnaires before the jurors actually come in or will we be looking at them at the same time that the jurors come in?

THE COURT: Marlon, what's the answer to that? I think you'll be looking at them before.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: We were planning on making copies and handing copies to counsel of those hardship questionnaires that claim hardship. Those that do not claim hardship we were not planning on making copies of those.

THE COURT: So I guess you see it will be pile A, which will be the people who don't claim a hardship; and pile B where the people ask to be excused. That's what you're going to see. You're going to see everybody who doesn't claim hardship. They will be part of the people who are sent upstairs.

Does that clarify?

MR. RODY: I think I'm following on what Mr. Jackson said. The question is: Who is determining to excuse people for hardship? Is the jury clerk doing that downstairs or will that be done by your Honor up here?

THE COURT: That's a good question.

MR. RODY: And would we get a chance to look at those hardship responses to determine whether those are valid and warranted, excusable?

THE COURT: Yes. I want you to look at the hardship questionnaires because those are people who are asking to be excused. The people who don't ask to be excused, Mr. Rody, will be here in the courtroom.

MR. RODY: Sure.

THE COURT: I guess it's my intention that you'll look at the people who are claiming hardship to make sure, in fact, it's a legitimate claim.

MR. RODY: I think that was the question.

THE COURT: Is that the trick question, Mr. Jackson?

I'm sorry it took me so long to understand the question. 1 2 MR. JACKSON: I think I phrased it somewhat unartfully, but that was part of it. And your Honor answered 3 4 the other part. So, thank you. 5 THE COURT: So the jurors will not be up here while 6 you're reviewing the hardship, people who have responded 7 affirmatively to the hardship questionnaire. Right, Marlon? THE DEPUTY CLERK: I'm sorry, Judge. I was not paying 8 attention. 9 10 THE COURT: I frequently have this problem. 11 So the parties will see the hardship questionnaires

So the parties will see the hardship questionnaires and people claiming hardship before they see the jurors.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes.

THE COURT: And then the ones that we agree there's a hardship, they will be excused downstairs. If we don't agree that there's a hardship or somebody disagrees as to the claim of hardship, we'll bring them upstairs.

MR. RODY: That's great. Thanks, Judge.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. JACKSON: No. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, are the marshals going to keep

Mr. Campo Flores and Flores de Freitas close by?

(Pause)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: We'll keep the defendants on the fifth floor -- fourth floor.

GB29FL01 Trial 1 I want to make sure it's all right with you, that 2 nobody raises an objection that the public has been excluded. We'll put the members of the public in an overflow courtroom 3 4 for the jury selection. 5 MR. BOVE: No objection from the government, your 6 Honor. 7 MR. JACKSON: We have no objection, your Honor. MR. RODY: No objection, Judge. 8 9 THE COURT: Make those arrangements now. 10 MR. RAYMOND: Nate Raymond with Reuters, a member of 11 the media. 12 I just want to make sure that the overflow room, 13 sometimes things aren't mic'd up well. So if, when jurors are 14 being questioned, if it's possible to make sure they are given 15 a mic so people can hear what they're responding to. That will 16 be my one concern with the overflow room. 17 THE COURT: Jurors are not mic'd. They're not going 18 to be mic'd. 19 MR. RAYMOND: It's going to be hard then to observe 20 and report on the voir dire process if we're not in the 21 courtroom. 22

THE COURT: Let me think about that.

23

24

25

What do you think about a live feed into the press room.

MR. RAYMOND: That's the same issue that with the

mic'ing. It's all the same system.

I have been in past trials. I have seen a mic passed around to jurors. That was doable. That might solve that issue. You're concerned about space in this courtroom. But I just want to raise that as an issue.

THE COURT: How many members of the working press are going to attend?

We'll see about getting a mic.

And then as soon as the jurors are whittled down to appropriate size so that you could have your own bench we'll try to get the press into the courtroom maybe at a back bench.

Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. NEUMEISTER: Judge, Larry Neumeister with the Associated Press.

Are you saying the press is not allowed in the courtroom? Like, no one from the press is allowed in the courtroom during the voir dire?

THE COURT: I'm saying the jurors are allowed in the courtroom. But the jurors are going to be numerous, so numerous that there won't be enough seats for the press.

MR. NEUMEISTER: There has to be at least representatives of the press, even if it's a small pool. The press cannot be totally excluded from the courtroom.

THE COURT: You wouldn't be excluded. You'd be in the overflow room.

GB29FL01

Trial

MR. NEUMEISTER: We have to be inside the courtroom. There has to be representatives inside the courtroom. There's plenty of legal precedent for this. I'm surprised the prosecutors aren't pointing that out. It could totally foul the trial. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. (Recess pending jury selection)